

November 8, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A6339

tension of the area redevelopment program, the extension of the so-called Economic Opportunities Act—the poverty program, the so-called Economic Development Act—accelerated Public Works Act—for several reasons: First, all are poorly drafted; second, they are duplicating; third, they are heavily involved in spoils politics and logrolling; fourth, they badly weaken instead of encourage local and State governments and private and church welfare programs; fifth, they miss their mark by keeping people on welfare or putting them in “make work” issues instead of putting them on their own feet; and sixth, their cost-benefit ratios are excessive. Note, however, the Republicans supported the further development of the Manpower Training Act which they originally conceived, and vocational and technical training and most features of the extension of the Federal education and research programs. The Republicans, joined by some congressional Democrats, proposed tax credit programs in lieu of direct Federal spending programs to accomplish these desired goals. However, the administration has taken a negative position on these proposals.

## MEDICARE

The Republicans opposed the medicare part of the Social Security Amendment Act while strongly supporting most of its other features. The Republicans had helped to develop and pass the Kerr-Mills Act and stood ready to improve it as a sounder method of meeting the problems of the aged.

## HOUSING

The Republicans opposed the moderate income housing subsidy bill for obvious reasons—moderate income people can do a better job of getting good housing for themselves than can the Federal Government. The Republicans point out the mess that has been made in the administration of public housing for low income people. It is regrettable that the urban renewal program which they developed has been perverted through unbelievably poor administration into a program which itself is now subject to much legitimate criticism.

The Republicans opposed the creation of a Cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Affairs. The title is a misnomer because it does not bring together under one department all Federal activities in housing or in urban affairs which was the primary justification advanced by its promoters. Furthermore, if the President was doing an adequate administrative job, much of the inefficiencies, redtape, and duplications could be eliminated without congressional action. Congress, indeed, has been remiss in its lack of oversight and not calling the President to task for the inefficiencies that exist. Finally, the creation of this Department was designed by some to deliberately bypass the State governments. Municipalities are creatures of the States. Where a metropolitan area covers several States, bistate or tristate agencies can be created—by Act of Congress under the constitutional powers specifically granted for this purpose. This power has been exercised in the past for the benefit of metropoli-

tan areas, such as the Missouri-Illinois bistate authority for the St. Louis metropolis but only with the involvement of the State governments.

## EDUCATION

Most education measures were developed and passed with bipartisan support. The Republicans did seek to substitute their tax credit education programs for the administration's direct expenditure programs, but when their efforts were unsuccessful they supported the modified administration bill. However, they opposed and sought to eliminate the creation of a National Teacher Corps. Most of the education measures passed by this Congress were not innovations, but extensions and developments of existing programs.

## THE VOTING RIGHTS BILL

This measure was developed with bipartisan support and would have been proposed and passed whoever was President and whichever party controlled the Congress. However, the Republicans did seek to have their proposal adopted. I think it was a stronger measure than that of the administration. Certainly it was a much fairer measure and, therefore, one which would have received much more cooperation from the southern communities which were primarily affected. A Republican sponsored measure to extend the bill to include vote frauds was adopted in spite of opposition from many big city Democrats in the north.

## IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY BILL

Again, here was a measure which would have been proposed and passed whoever was President and whichever party controlled the Congress. Like the voting rights bill, it had been under congressional study for sometime and was ripe for legislative action. The primary matter reaching an issue on a recorded vote was the so-called McGregor amendment, which applied quotas to the Western Hemisphere in a manner comparable to the quotas set up for the rest of the world. In my judgment, this act has been much overstated and misrepresented. It is not the liberalizing bill that has been advertised. If anything, the control of immigration has been turned over to our national labor leaders as the administration is presently set up. However, something had to be done to correct the erroneous impressions held abroad about our immigration laws, and the new law is a workable one.

## ELIMINATING SECTION 14(b) FROM THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

This passed the House by a very close vote, 221 ayes to 203 nays. As a result of the House studies and debate, the matter has been held up in the Senate. I have written extensively on the issues involved here, so I will not discuss it further. Obviously many congressional Democrats had to join the Republicans to have such a high negative vote.

## AGRICULTURE

The Republicans opposed the omnibus agriculture bill for many reasons, the inclusion of the bread tax being one of the most publicized. Very few people fail to agree that our agricultural programs need major overhauling. This major

overhaul still awaits action and, regretably, Congress has not been studying the issues with assiduity.

Republicans opposed the Tobacco Price Support Extension Act. Tobacco agriculture is probably more controlled by Government than any segment of agriculture. For many years it was pointed to as the ideal of farm programs. Now the long range ill effects of the political decisionmaking process being substituted for the marketplace process is being spelled out for all of us to see, even the tobacco grower.

There was a mixed vote by parties on the Federal Cigarette Advertising and Labeling Act. I think a very poor job was done in this matter by both the Congress and the President.

## MISCELLANEOUS

An interesting issue developed in the extension of the Atomic Energy Act in respect to the rights of a small community government dealing with a big powerful agency of the Federal Government. This, although becoming an issue of record vote, was not developed along party lines.

The Republicans largely opposed both the National Arts and Cultural Development Act as well as the act creating the National Foundation on Arts and Humanities. We are well aware of the fact that those who differ with us would have the people believe we are against art and culture. From our standpoint we opposed these two pieces of legislation because we are for art and culture. We do not believe the intervention of the Federal political mechanism into these areas benefit art and culture in the long run.

## HOME RULE FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

This bill serves as a good example of the Congress in opposition to the President, rather than Republicans against Democrats. Of course, the proponents of the President's bill sought to have the people believe this was a case of Republicans and southern Democrats alining to defeat the President's proposals. However, as in most of the cases where this allegation is made, the record vote serves to point up the inaccuracy. In addition, in this instance Congressman Sisk, of California, a well established liberal, offered the congressional substitute which passed the House in lieu of the President's proposal.

Congressional reapportionment and the Highway Beautification Act are other measures which did not have the disagreement centered on differences between the two parties, but, rather, differences between segments of both parties, although, because of what was felt to be improper pressures interfering with proper study and deliberation by the President, most Republicans opposed his version of how to get our highways beautified. The Federal pay raise was another example of disagreement between the President and the Congress, rather than disagreement between the two parties. In this instance I supported the President. I thought it important to hold to the President's wage-price guidelines, although I have been very critical over the years of the failure to get Federal

November 8, 1965

A6340

wages increased, particularly in a high-cost area like St. Louis. We still do not have a good system of Federal job reclassification and increased remuneration for Federal employees who work in high-cost areas. We are way behind the employment practices of many of our private companies.

Four procedural points came to a record vote which require some comment.

First. To increase the salaries of the Federal court judges. I thought the House behaved badly in making an issue here because of its disapproval—which I share, to a large degree—of some of the recent controversial Supreme Court decisions.

The Congress waived two statutory requirements which Republicans opposed, I thought, with very good reason.

Second. To permit General McKee to maintain his military position and yet be head of the Federal Aviation Authority. The law requires the FAA be headed by a civilian.

Third. To permit a film prepared by the U.S. Information Service for foreign propaganda to be shown in the United States. The law governing the USIS specifically states that no films or other materials prepared for foreign propaganda be released for domestic propaganda.

Fourth. Whether the Post Office Department should be required to give to the Congress the names of the temporary postal employees supposedly to be selected from the lower income groups to assist in fighting the war on poverty. This was a matter I was amazed to find the administration opposing, including Democratic leaders of Congress. Quite clearly Congress, as well as the public, should have this information and all information like it. To do otherwise invites corruption and other improper action on the part of the executive. This is an example of what I meant when I referred to the Congress failing in its oversight function, and actually pampering, instead of disciplining, the executive branch of Government.

Finally, there was the procedural problem involved in the issue of unseating the Mississippi Congressmen. The House looked very bad taking up a matter in September which should have been decided in February. Whatever one might feel about the issue itself, the failure to grant a timely and thorough hearing to those who felt they had a grievance hits at the heart of representative government. If the Congress does not maintain itself as a forum for people with grievances to be heard, then indeed it is difficult to complain if the people take to the street with these grievances. However, such action means that law and order itself have broken down, and this spells the failure of government itself, that is, government by laws, not government by men.

Now I would conclude with this observation. If you will look over the legislation which has become law this year, you will note that in spite of the propaganda to the contrary, most laws are extensions of existing programs or modifications of them. The only real innovations were the culmination of years of study; namely, medicare, the Immigration Act,

and the Voting Rights Act. The debasing of our currency and coinage and the restriction of private investment abroad are innovations all right but the result of temporizing, rather than of deliberation. The drift toward further inflation and international economic difficulties will continue as the trend to increase and extend Federal programs, not so much from introducing new ones, continues. Medicare, it is true, will sorely test the payroll tax on which all social security, unemployment insurance, and workmen's compensation are based.

The differences between the two political parties and between the President and the Congress are primarily differences of degree. All are interested in advancing peace, prosperity, freedom, and justice. The arguments lie over how we best do this for the long pull. No one is surely all right or all wrong. Through study and debate we can best give us the right decisions over the long pull. This is what representative government can provide, but to provide it the people as well as their representatives must take part in the study and debate and not be diverted from this difficult task by either arm twisting or demagoguery.

I hope this little summary will assist to some degree in furthering the study and deliberative process.

#### Louisiana State University Medical Center

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. HALE BOGGS OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the great work being done by the Louisiana State University Medical Center in its successful collaborative scientific programs, particularly in Latin America, for many years.

I am indebted to Dr. William W. Frye, chancellor of the medical center, for furnishing me detailed reports of the progress in these programs. He has also summarized the work and I would like to include that summary in the Appendix of the Record, as follows:

#### SUMMARY OF PROGRAM

The first program which was initiated is a training program in tropical medicine, infectious diseases, and public health. This is financed by a training grant from the National Institutes of Health. It is designed for the staff members and for advanced students of medical schools throughout the country, and for advanced graduate students. This program has been in progress for more than 10 years. Remarkable collaboration has been received in this endeavor from Latin American medical scientists. Out of the program have evolved two other inter-American collaborative projects.

Since 1959, the LSU School of Medicine has been assisting the University of Costa Rica School of Medicine, through an AID grant, in the development of a school of medicine. Most of their staff members have come to our school of medicine for training. Conversely, a large number of the LSU staff have gone to

Costa Rica to assist them in the development of the teaching program at their new medical school. The first class of the new medical school will be graduated in January 1966. President Hunter and several members of the board of supervisors have been invited to attend.

Our third, and major collaborative undertaking, is the LSU International Center for Medical Research and Training in Costa Rica, Central America (LSU-ICMRT). This center is supported largely by funds awarded to LSU by the Public Health Service through the Office of International Research of the National Institutes of Health.

One remarkable finding of the research programs of the LSU-ICMRT has been the demonstration of a significant association between certain viruses and diarrhea. Thus, a group of viruses in association with diarrhea has emerged from these studies which may well assume a major role in the causation of endemic diarrhea and thus lead to its control. In many areas of the world, diarrheal diseases represent the major cause of death in the young age groups. You will also remember that diarrheal diseases are extremely important to the military. These findings have not been published yet and thus are not subject to general release.

Studies of a wide range, e.g., cancer of the stomach, infectious hepatitis, parasitic diseases and others, are included in the scope of the research and training activities of the LSU-ICMRT. These centers offer remarkable opportunities for collaborative research and research training in diseases of mutual importance to the United States and the host countries.

#### Anti-American Sentiment in the Dominican Republic

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. CLAUDE PEPPER OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following letter which I received recently from a close friend and constituent regarding the political sentiment in the Dominican Republic:

MIAMI, FLA.,  
October 6, 1965.

Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CLAUDE: For several years I have kept in close touch with the political situation in the Dominican Republic through responsible American and Dominican citizens who live and have their businesses there.

When the Johnson administration sent American troops into San Domingo to quell the Communist revolution I received nothing but words of gratitude to the United States for having quickly stepped in and saved the Dominicans from the slavery of communism. They had rejoiced when they threw off the yoke of Trujillo and now they were rejoicing once again that President Johnson had saved them from the tyranny of communism.

But today—only a few months later—I hear nothing but scorn and contempt for the OAS and our bungling State Department who have turned victory into defeat by handing over the Dominican Republic to the Communist revolutionists.

The State Department put a gun in Gen. Weissin y Weissin's back and hijacked him.

He was the hope and symbol of anti-Communism around whom the anti-Communists could rally but thanks to our State Department they forced him to leave, turned the Dominican Government over to the Communists, ousted the true patriots, and probably will comply with the revolutionists demands for loss of pay suffered as a result of their unemployment brought on by the revolution they started.

Is it any wonder that now most American and Dominican citizens—anti-Communists and Communists alike—now say, "Yankees go home."

Neither I, nor my friends in the Dominican Republic, can be classified as alarmists, but this is one time that we are alarmed.

With kind personal regards, I am

Sincerely,

WILLIAM C. MARTIN.

## The United Nations After 20 Years

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I recently had the honor of addressing the convocation of the College of Idaho at Caldwell, Idaho. This gathering of concerned faculty members and students shared our interest in international cooperation expressed in congressional support for the International Cooperation Year and the continued development of the United Nations.

In my remarks, I attempted to review the silent strengths of the United Nations in its 20 years of existence, and our hopes for the future role of the U.N.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of my address.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### THE UNITED NATIONS AFTER 20 YEARS

(Address by Senator CHURCH)

This year marks the 20th anniversary of the birth of the United Nations. As if in celebration, the U.N. has presented the world with a very special birthday gift—a truce in the dangerous war between Pakistan and India.

Such accomplishments account for the continuing respect which most Americans hold for the United Nations. We thought it wholly appropriate, for example, that so eminent a citizen as Adlai Stevenson, twice a candidate for President of the United States, should serve as our Ambassador at the U.N. And we found ourselves in general agreement with Arthur Goldberg, when he gave up a coveted seat on the Supreme Court, in order to become Stevenson's successor.

Fortunately, this esteem for the United Nations is widely shared by the foremost figures of the world. The recent visit to the U.N. by Pope Paul VI is indicative. As the first Catholic Pope ever to journey to the New World, Paul's mission was the cause of peace, but his commitment was to the United Nations.

I was privileged to be present at the General Assembly when Pope Paul delivered his historic message. I was struck by the fervor of his plea for peace, and by the strength of his endorsement of the United Nations. Not only did he call it the "last hope of con-

cord and peace," but he described it as "a bridge between peoples" helping "to hasten their economic and social progress."

The dream of an international organization that would function as global guardian of the peace, was first envisioned by a great American President. Surveying the senseless carnage of the First World War, Woodrow Wilson recognized how desperately mankind needed to put an end to the anarchy among nations. For this purpose, he proposed that the victors should establish a League of Nations, to which the vanquished might also repair, where all sovereign states would act in concert to keep the peace.

But the victors of the First World War fell apart almost as soon as the guns fell silent. Wilson's dream was subverted, not so much by the Allied Governments with whom we fought, as by our own, when the U.S. Senate refused to sanction American participation in the League.

It was left to another generation of Americans, under the leadership of another great President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, to fashion from the wreckage of the Second World War a successor to the League that was finally to secure the participation and support of our own Government.

Originally, at San Francisco in 1945, we constructed the United Nations upon the great alliance which was winning the Second World War. In the mistaken belief that the victors, united in war by a common enemy, would remain united afterward, we entrusted the peacekeeping power, not to the General Assembly where all countries were to be equally represented, but to the Security Council, where the Big Five would have permanent seats, each equipped with a built-in veto. Our vision was of a Pax Victorium, where peace would be maintained by the United States, acting in concert with her allies, the United Kingdom, France, China, and the Soviet Union. The veto was to guarantee that no policeman's club would be raised to enforce the peace, except by the common consent of the Big Five.

Looking back on those euphoric days, one wonders how so infirm an infant as the United Nations could ever have received so auspicious a christening. We supporters of the U.N., then and now, bear a responsibility for having oversold it to the American people. From the outset, we should have stressed that the U.N. itself lacked the power to preserve world peace, having neither the means to finance its own operation nor to impose its will; that the Security Council could only act with the unanimous consent of its permanent members, the Big Five; that the General Assembly could pass resolutions, but could not enforce them; that the U.N. was not, in any sense, a world government, and could not possibly be described as the "Parliament of Man." Consequently, we should have emphasized that, in keeping the peace and protecting our national interests, the U.N. could be no substitute for our own Armed Forces, our nuclear deterrent, our regional alliances, or our mutual assistance programs abroad.

Having said all this, we could then have endorsed the United Nations for realistic reasons—as a useful instrument through which the sovereign nations of the world might strive to build better procedures for achieving the peaceful settlement of international disputes; as the one forum that could hold out the promise, as it grew in strength and stature, of ultimately replacing today's rule of violence with tomorrow's rule of law.

If, following the San Francisco conference, we had made this kind of factual case for our entry into the United Nations, I believe the American people would not have been left to nurse the exaggerated expectation that the U.N. would prove a panacea for peace. Then, perhaps, the failures of the U.N., which were bound to come, would not

have loomed so large. Much disillusionment could have been avoided. And fewer today would be the voices attracted to that mindless chant: "Get the United States out of the U.N., and the U.N. out of the United States." For once the United Nations is seen in its proper light, the wonder is not that it has accomplished so little, but that it has accomplished so much.

First of all, it somehow managed to survive the precipitous breakup of the wartime alliance which had pasted it together. As cold war enmity divided the victors into two camps, the Security Council was quickly manacled by the use of the veto. But most of the member countries were determined that the U.N. should not be rendered impotent so quickly, and they found a way, within the charter, to upgrade the role of the General Assembly. The U.N. remained relevant after all, as a sentinel for peace.

Nevertheless, it seemed, for a time, that the cold war might limit the United Nations to the function of a sounding board for the smaller countries, and a convenient meeting place where the channels of communication could be kept open for the use of the major powers in periods of crisis. Indeed, the U.N. has played a most useful role in this respect. I recall, in 1949, while we were airlifting supplies into blockaded Berlin, how informal talks began between our U.N. representative, Philip Jessup, and the Soviet's Jacob Malik, in the U.N. diplomats' lounge. In this casual setting, Malik first hinted that Moscow might be willing to end the blockade, and here the talks were pursued which eventually led to that result.

Even more dramatic was the mediating role of the U.N. during the dread Cuban missile showdown of 1962. The Russian veto could not prevent the Security Council from serving as a stage on which the United States could tellingly present, before the assembled nations of the world, indisputable evidence of Soviet mendacity, thus helping to galvanize world opinion behind the audacious action President Kennedy had announced. The good offices of the U.N. then served to bring our former Ambassador, the late Adlai Stevenson, and John J. McCloy, into continuing contact with Soviet envoy Kuznetsov, for negotiations in which the Secretary General of the United Nations, U Thant, played a vital part. Ambassador Stevenson once summed it up this way:

"At a critical moment, when the nuclear powers seemed to be set on a collision course, the Secretary General's intervention led to the diversion of the Soviet ships headed for Cuba and interception by our Navy. This was an indispensable first step in the peaceful resolution of the Cuban crisis. The mere existence of an impartial office which could perform such a service in the middle of the night at such a time, is no small asset to the human race."

So it has happened that the United Nations, while not performing its intended role as policeman for the victors, has served as their mediator instead, helping in this way to keep the cold war from turning hot.

Though nuclear suicide has thus far been averted, the brushfire wars have not, and these peripheral struggles will continue to endanger the uncertain stability which tenuously rests upon the present nuclear stalemate. In dealing with these flareups, the U.N. has developed a role, not confined to mediation, but extending to active involvement as a kind of fire brigade.

It started in Korea in 1950, where force was invoked under the U.N. flag to defend a member state against invasion from without. To be sure, most of the troops were American and South Korean, and all were under U.S. command, but the fact that the operation was carried out in the name of the United Nations, and did entail token forces from a host of other countries, undoubtedly helped to keep the Soviet Union away from a direct confrontation with the United States.



November 8, 1965

Moreover, the U.N. auspices did much to mobilize world opinion against the aggression, to a degree that American unilateral action never could have accomplished.

The limited participation of the U.N. in the Korean war led it to become centrally involved as the principal fireman in snuffing out the fighting at Suez in 1956. This time a way was found to set up a U.N. command, with troops furnished by the smaller member nations, whose mission it was to restore peace and order along the Gaza strip. The presence of these impartial sentinels to patrol the seething boundary between Egypt and Israel proved acceptable to both countries, and enabled the French and British to disengage without disgrace. U.N. forces still remain in Gaza, where they have been successful, thus far, in preventing any new eruption along this uneasy border.

The biggest fire brigade operation yet undertaken by the United Nations occurred in the Congo. Here again, the intervention of the U.N., at the request of the Congolese Government, was indispensable to restoring order out of a chaos which threatened to engulf all of central Africa. Had we gone in alone to do this job, as some of our shrill U.N. critics advocated, I daresay we would find ourselves today in the same bottomless quagmire, faced with the same dreary prospects, with which we are in truth confronted in South Vietnam.

Since the Congo, the U.N. has played a vital part in arranging a cease-fire in both Cyprus, and as mentioned earlier, in the India-Pakistan war over Kashmir. In neither of these situations, do we now have a guaranteed peace, but the chances for avoiding further bloodshed have been brightened by the persistence of the United Nations.

Wherever the U.N. has acted as a world policeman, we have found our own national interests well served. Several months ago, on the floor of the Senate, I advocated that we enlist the help of the U.N. in the search for a peaceful solution in Vietnam, and I have been encouraged by the moves President Johnson has since made in this direction.

The notable peacemaking successes of the U.N. in Africa and Asia, contain a lesson that we should not overlook. The U.N. has no race, creed, or color; it is as varied in its composition as the 117 countries that now make up its membership. The U.N. bears no onus for ever having engaged in colonialism or imperialism; it lacks the intrinsic power to menace even little countries, and so it is neither feared nor distrusted by them. Finally, the U.N. is a genuine international organization which does not separate the "have" countries from the "have nots," the big from the small, the strong from the weak, the developed from the undeveloped, the capitalist from the Socialist, or even the Communist. It has refused to become the handmaiden of any particular alignment or ideology.

If experience proves anything at all, it is that upheaval among the black, brown, and yellow peoples, now emerging in their own right throughout Africa and Asia, is not likely to be assuaged for long through the unilateral intervention of any white nation. The empires which Western power could not hold, that power cannot now pacify. But because the United Nations has proved itself to be theirs, as well as ours, it can often play the role of "honest broker" and even that of the welcome policeman on the beat, when violence breaks out within, or between, countries which were so recently the restive possessions of the Western World.

One cannot appreciate the full scope or significance of the United Nations without a look at its work to improve living standards. The widening gap between the rich nations and the poor, which, in the main, separates those countries of predominantly white population from the colored, lies like

a time bomb beneath our superficial efforts to preserve stability and peace. Unless this gap can be held in check and then narrowed in the years ahead, the time may come when the ideological differences dividing the Western World will be swept aside, as the affluent white nations join common cause against the looming specter of racial war.

To avoid this catastrophe, the United Nations is at work, helping to channel both know-how and capital from the rich industrial countries to the poor undeveloped. Of every 20 U.N. employees, 17 are engaged in these programs of social progress and economic growth. Through the U.N.'s World Health Organization, tropical diseases are under relentless attack—malaria is about to be eradicated from the face of the earth.

Various U.N. agencies are making loans and technical guidance available to promote monetary stability and long-range economic development—the World Bank, the International Finance Corporation, the International Development Association, the International Monetary Fund, the technical assistance program, and the Special Fund.

As for our own foreign aid program, nothing gives us greater trouble than trying to reconcile our belief that improving living standards abroad is a goal in itself, which ultimately serves our national interest, with the awkwardness of extending American grants and loans to countries engaging in policies that we regard as unfriendly. This is not only hard for the American people to understand; it is equally incomprehensible to the recipient governments. Our own people conclude that we are embarked upon the folly of trying to buy friends, while the foreign governments concerned suspect that we are offering them money to make them subservient, and so either demand the money without strings attached, or engage in that now-familiar game of diplomatic blackmail, obtaining their own terms by playing us off against the Russians or the Chinese.

This experience, coupled with the fact that other rich nations should bear their share of the cost, has caused the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to recommend that the United States shift its emphasis—from a bilateral basis to a multilateral basis—in the making of long-term loans for economic development. This would mean expanding the role of the U.N. agencies, an objective I strongly favor, not only for diplomatic reasons, but for sound business reasons as well. Eugene Black, who so ably managed the affairs of the World Bank, has explained the success of investments made through the U.N. leading agencies, in these words:

"Because they are known to have no ulterior motive, they can exert more influence over the use of a loan than is possible for a bilateral lender; they can insist that the projects for which they lend are established on a sound basis, and—most important—they can make their lending conditional upon commensurate efforts being made by the recipient country itself."

In your home community, a loan extended on hard terms by a self-styled friend is usually resented by the person receiving it, although that same person would expect such terms from the local bank. It is no different in the community of nations.

In its role of nation building, the work of the U.N. has barely begun. Nowhere is this more evident than in the compelling need to vastly expand the world's supply of food.

We Americans find it hard to realize that hunger stalks the world. Most of us have more than enough to eat; our most common problem is overeating, so the doctors may. But more than half the world's people suffer from chronic malnutrition. And the hunger problem is getting worse, not better. If drastic measures are not taken soon, it is estimated that the diet of two out of every

three people in the world will deteriorate, rather than improve, in the years ahead.

The reason is not hard to guess. It has taken 100,000 years for the world's population to reach its present level of 3 billion people. In 35 years, between now and the end of this century, 3 billion more will be added.

India exemplifies the incredible population explosion the world must face. Within a scant 15 years, India's population will grow by another 200 million people, which is more than the present population of the United States.

Already, in Latin America, we see the drain on food supply occasioned by the burgeoning population. In the thirties, Latin America was the greatest grain-exporting region of the world. Today, Latin America imports more grain than it exports. By the year 2000, 600 million Latin Americans will compete for a food supply which now scarcely feeds 250 million.

Obviously, the problem is much too big for any one nation to solve, even one with such food surpluses as our own. Only by banding together to achieve more efficient distribution of food, to irrigate vast stretches of now unproductive, arid land, to learn methods for harvesting the untapped bounty of the oceans, and to greatly increase the agricultural yield in the underdeveloped countries, can we hope to meet the challenge of the astounding population growth, and escape the brutal upheaval that the scourge of famine will spread across a stricken world.

Can anyone doubt that the United Nations must become the operational center of this great, global enterprise? Can anyone really believe that its importance to the human race will not grow larger with each passing year?

Yes, there are those who do not believe it. Even in this enlightened country, a militant minority of U.N. haters are zealously at work. Disdaining all things foreign, they see the world through Red glasses. To them, the U.N. is some kind of Communist trick. If you tell them that, on its own voting record, the U.N. has shown itself a friend of freedom—that no Soviet resolution actively opposed by the United States has ever been approved by the General Assembly, they respond that this is but a clever ploy to disguise the true Communist character of the organization. If you remind them that the Soviet Union has had to exercise her veto more than a hundred times in the Security Council, to prevent it from taking action against Russian interests, while the United States has yet to cast her first veto vote, they respond, with straight faces, that this proves U.N. procedures were set up to serve the Russians best. These anguished people can never be persuaded.

But fortunately, the great bulk of our people are better balanced and better informed. Commonsense tells them that, despite the diversity among nations, or the conflicts in ideology, we all share a common interest in survival. As Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, has observed: "In the world of today any breach of the peace could lead to the destruction of civilization. In the thermonuclear age, any instrumentality with the potential for deterring war can hardly be described as less than indispensable to mankind."

In June of this year, I introduced a resolution in the Senate, quickly approved in both Houses, vigorously reaffirming congressional support of the United Nations. A few days later, it was my privilege to accompany President Johnson to San Francisco, where he addressed the 20th anniversary celebration. There, I heard him renew our pledge to uphold the Charter of the United Nations, with these memorable words:

"I do know this: Whether we look for judgment to God, or to history, or to mankind, this is the age, and we are the men,